

AD-A278 243



TATION PAGE

FORM APPROVED  
DATE 10/1/86

To average 1 hour per response, including the time for the collection of information, and communication of the information to the Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Management and subject Paperwork Reduction Project.

DATE

3 REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED

ANNUAL 01 Sep 92 TO 31 Aug 93

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

(FY91 AASERT), CELLULAR ANALYSIS OF THE STARTLE REFLEX

F49620-92-J-0300

6. AUTHOR(S)

Dr Michael Davis

61103D

3484

S4

(2)

DTIC

ELECTE

APR 20 1994

S F D

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Dept of Psychiatry  
Yale University  
School of Medicine  
34 Park Street  
New Haven, CT 06508

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

AFOSR-TR-94 0224

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

AFOSR/NL  
110 DUNCAN AVE SUITE B115  
BOLLING AFB DC 20332-0001

94-11920



206

Dr Genevieve M. Haddad

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release;  
distribution unlimited

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

In the AASERT Award we are interested in how dopamine agonists affect baseline startle amplitude as well as the phenomenon of pre-pulse inhibition. To test this, we have been recording the compound action potential generated by an auditory stimulus at the level of the cochlear nucleus in freely moving rats using a bundle of four previously implanted 25 um nichrome wires. Each of the dopamine agonists increased the amplitude of the auditory nerve response (N1 component, latency = 0.75 msec - Meloni & Davis, 1993). This effect is larger following repeated administration of d-amphetamine on each of 7 days, indicating that it shows sensitization. This suggests that dopamine agonists ultimately can alter processes at the very beginning of the auditory system, which we believe may have considerable relevance for dopamine-induced disruption of auditory prepulse inhibition as well as auditory distractibility and even auditory hallucinations in people.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

14. SUBJECT TERMS

15. NUMBER OF PAGES

16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
OF REPORT

(U)

18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
OF THIS PAGE

(U)

19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
OF ABSTRACT

(U)

20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

(U)

94 4 19 040

AFOSR-TR- 94 0224

Approved for public release;  
distribution unlimited.

## Interim Technical Report

Number: F49620-92-J-0300 (the Assert Award)

Title: Cellular Analysis of the Startle Reflex

PI: Michael Davis

## Effects of dopamine agonists on compound action potentials recorded in the cochlear nucleus.

In the Assert Award we are interested in how dopamine agonists affect baseline startle amplitude as well as the phenomenon of pre-pulse inhibition, described earlier. Prior work in our laboratory had found that dopamine agonists such as apomorphine, d-amphetamine or cocaine all increased acoustic startle amplitude (Davis & Aghajanian, 1976; Davis et al., 1975; Davis, 1985). By eliciting startle electrically we deduced that each of these drugs increased startle by acting very early in the acoustic startle pathway (i.e., at or before the cochlear nucleus - Davis et al., 1986; Harty & Davis, 1985).

To test this, we have been recording the compound action potential generated by an auditory stimulus at the level of the cochlear nucleus in freely moving rats using a bundle of four previously implanted 25  $\mu$ m nichrome wires. Each of the dopamine agonists increased the amplitude of the auditory nerve response (N1 component, latency = 0.75 msec - Meloni & Davis, 1993). This effect is larger following repeated administration of d-amphetamine on each of 7 days, indicating that it shows sensitization. This suggests that dopamine agonists ultimately can alter processes at the very beginning of the auditory system, which we believe may have considerable relevance for dopamine-induced disruption of auditory prepulse inhibition as well as auditory distractibility and even auditory hallucinations in people.

There are only a limited number of ways in which a dopamine agonist could affect the compound action potential. One peripheral mechanism would be via a change in blood pressure at the cochlea. However, other drugs which either increase or decrease blood pressure have not produced consistent effects on the compound action potential (Meloni and Davis, unpublished). Other peripheral mechanisms would be via direct actions on dopamine receptors in the cochlea, which is known to contain dopamine (Eybalin et al., 1993; Gil-Loyzaga & Pares-Herbute, 1989) or the middle ear muscle reflex. Direct actions in the cochlear seem unlikely because we have found that lesions of the substantia innominata in the forebrain block both the excitatory effects of apomorphine on acoustic startle and the facilitation of the compound action potential (Meloni & Davis, 1993), suggesting a central rather than peripheral site where the effects of apomorphine are initiated. A central mechanism would be via the olivary cochlear bundle, through which cells in the lateral superior olive and ventral nucleus of the trapezoid (in rats) project directly to inner and outer hair cells and modulate their activity (cf. White and Warr, 1983). This is an especially intriguing possibility because an efferent brain system which projects directly to the primary auditory receptors has long been suspected to be involved in processes such as sensory gating and attention (Hernandez-Peon, 1956; Oatman, 1971). In fact, we find that local anesthetics applied to the olivary cochlear bundle markedly increase the compound action potential in waking but not anesthetized rats (Meloni and Davis, unpublished). If dopamine agonists somehow inhibited olivary cochlear function, this might lead to an increase in baseline startle amplitude and/or to a disruption of prepulse inhibition. In fact, this inhibitory system is especially effective in altering responsivity to relatively weak stimuli (cf. Wiederhold, 1986) and has been shown to be critical for modulating auditory signals in the presence of masking noise (Nider & Nider, 1970; Kawase & Liberman, 1993). In rats, disruption of prepulse inhibition by apomorphine generally has been most effective when the intensity separation between the prepulse and background noise has been smaller than about 10 dB (Davis et al., 1990). Hence, another major goal of the proposed studies will be to evaluate the role of the olivary cochlear bundle in prepulse inhibition and its disruption by apomorphine.

Dist

A-1